

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, and 15-20 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, and 13 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, and 15-20 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Albal, U.S. Patent No. 5,826,034, and in further view of Yoshida et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,331. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yoshida discloses an image forming apparatus resuming an interrupted image forming job when power is restored. A copy machine looks to the work data area of RAM 302 when a power supply is turned on. If data is kept in the work data area when the power supply is turned on, the status of the copying state of the copy machine just before the power supply was turned off is resumed according to the parameters stored in the work data area (col. 5, lines 1-6). The work data area contains image forming conditions of a program including parameters and the like for operating the program (col. 4, lines 31-33 and lines 53-54). The work data area does not contain data derived from optically scanning a document. The data derived from optically scanning documents is stored in image memory 303 (col. 3, lines 45-46). The image memory 303 is not examined for electronic data after an interruption in electrical power. Since Yoshida does not disclose a work data area of RAM 302 containing data derived from optically scanning a document and does not disclose image memory 303 being examined for electronic data after an interruption in electrical power, Yoshida does not disclose examining a storage device for electronic data derived from optically scanning a document, after the interruption in electrical power.

In contrast, Applicants' independent claims 1, 8, and 13, include wording that the storage device is examined for the electronic data derived from optically scanning a document, after an interruption (or restoration) of electrical power.

Applicants' have amended claims 1, 8, and 13 to make explicit that the electronic data looked for in the storage device is the electronic data recited in the preamble of the claims, namely, the electronic data derived from optically scanning a document. The Examiner does not assert that Albal discloses these limitations and, as discussed above, Yoshida does not include these limitations. Since neither Yoshida nor Albal includes these limitations, the combination of Park and Albal does not make Applicants' claims 1, 8, and 13 obvious.

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Albal, U.S. Patent No. 5,826,034, in view of Yoshida et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,331, and in further view of Park, U.S. Patent No. 6,545,774. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 4).

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Albal, U.S. Patent No. 5,826,034, in view of Yoshida et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,331, and in further view of Nobuta, U.S. Patent No. 5,258,853. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 2).

In view of Applicants' arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 13 being allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the cited art, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicants claim.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen K. Johnson  
Kristin S. Dahl  
Theresa L. McGuire  
And Clint S. Cuzzo

By   
Mark G. Pannell  
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 06/18/2004  
(719) 260-7900